

## REMARKS

### **I. Introduction**

Claims 8 to 14 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a) and 1.84(p)(4). It is respectfully submitted that these objections should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), while this section requires the drawings to show every feature specified in the claims, it also provides that “conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be” -- but are not required to be -- “illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation.” The features of a converter and a device adapted to sense current and arranged inside the converter, in claim 8, and the analog-to-digital converter integrated in one of a microcontroller and a microprocessor, in claim 9, need not be illustrated since a detailed illustration thereof is not essential for a proper understanding of the claimed subject matter, and because the microcontroller 2 of Fig. 2, which also represents a microprocessor, can include an integrated analog to digital converter as described in the Specification at, e.g., page 2, lines 26 to 29.

Regarding the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4) since the same reference numerals allegedly refer to different features, Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. The reference numerals used in the drawings do not refer to different features. Rather, the same reference numerals are used to refer to the same features in different drawings. Reference character 2 is used in the Specification to refer to a microcontroller. Contrary to the assertions included in the Office Action, reference character 2 is not used in the Specification to refer to an analog-to-digital converter. Rather, the Specification plainly sets forth that reference character 2 refers to a microcontroller. This use of reference numerals is consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4), which states that “[t]he same part of an invention appearing in more than one view of the drawing must always be designated by the

same reference character, and the same reference character must never be used to designate different parts.”

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings fully comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a) and 1.84(p)(4). Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 8, 9, and 12 to 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 8 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,048 (“Zenoni et al.”) and U.S. Patent No. 4,958,269 (“Gritter”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 8 relates to a converter, including, *inter alia*, the features of a device adapted to sense currents fed to an electric motor powered by the converter, the device arranged inside the converter, signals of the device fed to a nonlinear filter, and output signals of the nonlinear filter fed to an additional filter that is connected to an analog-to-digital converter.

The combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 8. The Office Action admits on page 4 that Zenoni et al. “does not disclose a nonlinear filter” but contends that Gritter describes this feature in claim 8.

Gritter purports to relate to a motor control for controlling current in an induction motor, including, a microcomputer, speed control, and a current sensing circuit. According to Gritter, as the motor rotor rotates, a series of sharp spikes is produced which are ineffective in reducing motor speed. To reduce the speed, “a nonlinear filter is interposed between the differential amplifier output and the comparator input” which produces “a more smoothly varying control signal.” Col. 2, lines 16 to 31. Claim 8 of Gritter states that the motor control includes “a nonlinear filter . . . so that the current signal is more representative of motor current during intervals when D.C. Bus current is zero.” While Gritter may mention a nonlinear filter and indicate that using a nonlinear filter produces a better signal, nowhere, does Gritter disclose that output signals of a nonlinear filter are fed to an additional filter that is connected to an analog-to-digital converter, in context of the present claims. Thus, the combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter does not disclose, or even

suggest, all of the features of claim 8. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter et al. does not render unpatentable claim 8.

As for claims 9 to 14, which depend from claim 8, and therefore include all of the features included in claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that Zenoni et al. and Gritter et al. do not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

With further respect to claim 10, claim 10 additionally recites that the nonlinear filter includes a run-up transmitter. The combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter does not disclose, or even suggest, this feature. The Office Action at page 4 refers to reference numerals 56, 60, and 62 in Fig. 1 of Gritter as allegedly disclosing that the nonlinear filter includes a run-up transmitter. References numerals 56, 60, and 62, however, refer to a **differential amplifier, filtering circuit, and comparator**, respectively, not to a **run-up transmitter**. Nowhere, does Gritter disclose, or even suggest, that a nonlinear filter includes a run-up transmitter.

With further respect to claim 11, claim 11 additionally recites that the run-up transmitter includes a comparator and an integrator. The combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter does not disclose, or even suggest, this feature. The Office Action at page 4 refers to reference numeral 62 of Gritter as allegedly disclosing an integrator. According to Gritter, however, reference numeral 62 refers to a **comparator** not an **integrator**. Further, reference 56, which according to Gritter is a differential amplifier, also does not constitute an integrator. Thus, nowhere does the combination of Zenoni et al. and Gritter disclose, or even suggest, an integrator.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 29, 2009

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/  
Clifford A. Ulrich  
Reg. No. 42,194  
KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**